

Appln. No. 09/856,319
Amd. dated March 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2004

REMARKS

The Office Action has been carefully reviewed. No claim is allowed. Claim 32 presently appears in this application and defines patentable subject matter warranting its allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are hereby respectfully solicited.

Claim 32 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C., second paragraph, as being indefinite. The examiner states that the claim is indefinite because it fails to set forth a terminal process step that clearly relates back to the preamble. The examiner asserts that it is unclear what method steps are further comprised within the method which provide the basis for detecting pancreatitis. It is the examiner's position that the claim should be amended to set forth the means by which findings are correlated with pancreatitis.

Claim 32 is now amended to recite a terminal process step of "detecting pancreatitis by determining if the concentration of the protein or fragment thereof represents an increased level of the protein or fragment thereof in the blood or urine of the individual", as supported in the specification on page 17, lines 7-10, page 45, lines 10-14, and page 60, Example 6. Applicants believe that the indefiniteness issues raised by the examiner are obviated by the amendment to claim 32.


Appln. No. 09/856,319
Amd. dated March 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2004

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are
therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, the claims comply with 35 U.S.C.
§112 and define patentable subject matter warranting their
allowance. Favorable consideration and early allowance are
earnestly urged.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Allen C. Yun
Registration No. 37,971

ACY:pp
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\A\Aoyb\UemuraS\PTO\amd QA 2-25-04.doc